

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

By way of the present reply, claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 21, and 22 are amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-26 are now pending in this application.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the arguments presented in the Amendment and Reply of March 23, 2009 were not persuasive and therefore maintained the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-19, and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,362,742 to Siddiqi et al. ("Siddiqi"). In addition, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 6, 12, 20, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siddiqi in view of U.S. 2005/0060574 to Kime et al. ("Kime"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectively submits that these rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

The cited reference to Siddiqi collects transfer information containing only the information of the network layer (Layer 3). *See* Siddiqi at Fig. 4 and accompanying text. On the other hand, the invention as presently claimed extracts the address of which the transfer destination is a port of a wireless interface. That is, it employs the physical information of the datalink layer (Layer 2). Thus, the present invention differs from Siddiqi in at least this respect. The pending claims have been amended to clarify this distinction.

The above noted feature is significant because it permits identification of the fact that the address is one that is connected via a wireless network. Further, as described at paragraph

[0036], the condition of the connection relation can be determined without requiring information that is unique to the vendor.

Kime is cited as allegedly teaching other features of the claims that are absent from Siddiqi, and fails to remedy the above-noted deficiency.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections under §§ 102 and 103 should be withdrawn and that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/4/2005

By



FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072